DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 340 070 CS 507 678

AUTHOR Ludlum, M. P.
TITLE Declining NDT Participation: Causes and Cures.
PUB DATE Nov 91
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (77th, Atlanta, GA, October 31-November 3, 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Research; *Debate; Higher Education; National Surveys; *Persuasive Discourse; Questionnaires; *Speech Communication
IDENTIFIERS *Debate Tournaments; *National Debate Tournament

ABSTRACT

A study investigated the reason for the decline in participation in NDT (National Debate Tournament) debate. An anonymous poll of forensic programs was conducted to encourage a frank and open description of the issues surrounding the problem. One hundred thirty colleges and universities in America (out of 354) responded to a questionnaire. The list of schools was compiled from those active in NDT, CEDA (Cross Examination Debate Association) or Individual Events for the 1988-1989 school year. Results indicated that almost 25% of the programs offer only one forensic activity and that 75% of the programs offer only one or two events. Few programs use graduate assistants, and the forensics field is dominated by communications departments. Results also indicated that changes are needed and desired to increase participation, and that the only serious blemish to forensics is the loss of some schools which may not be quickly returning. Results showed, however, that their reasons for leaving do not reflect poorly on the activity, but rather show the extreme amount of dedication needed both from the participants and the school administrators to make a forensics program successful. (Two appendixes provide: (1) a breakdown of the cumulative results put in the format of the original poll; and (2) a list of cumulative results in rank order. (PRA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

DECLINING NDT PARTICIPATION: CAUSES AND CURES

ED340070

US 7178

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. P. "Marty" Sudkamm

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DECLINING NDT PARTICIPATION: CAUSES AND CURES

By

M.P. "Marty" Ludlum
Cameron University
P.O. Box 1067
Lawton, Oklahoma 73502
(405) 248-5062 Work
(405) 536-4629 Home

Paper Presented to the Forensics Division of the Speech Communication Association at the 1991 Annual Convention, November 1-3, at Atlanta, Georgia.

I. INTRODUCTION

Participation in NDT Debate has declined for several years. I wished to discover if the decline occurred for reasons internal to the activity or if it was a symptom of a greater problem. To discover an accurate view I would require an anonymous poll of forensic programs to encourage a frank and open description of the issues surrounding this multifaceted problem.

This paper represents the information discovered through the poll. I will begin with a brief history of the decline of NDT participation. Then I will focus on the poll respondents and methodology. Next, I will focus on the present status of forensic programs and expectations of the future of forensics. I will then describe several reasons for the decline in NDT participation. I will follow with the respondents' proposals to increase NDT participation, focusing on those which are within the power of the Forensics community to change. I will conclude with an

ASS07678

analysis of schools which have recently abandoned their forensics programs.

Let me begin by stating I do not start with the assumption "something is wrong with NDT." I begin my analysis with over a decade of declining NDT participation and the belief that many factors, both within and outside the activity contribute to the decline

NDT Participation is Dying

Commentators have warned of declining NDT participation. Over a decade ago, Kovalcheck (1979) and Howe (1979) noted a decline in the activity. Ashmore (1981) wrote that the abusive style of delivery had largely caused this problem. Few in the activity were willing to listen or simply refused to take corrective measures. Dempsey & Hartman (1986) noted that exodus continued throughout the early 1980s. The number of subscribers to NDT dropped from 237 in 1983 to just 180 by 1986 (NDT Archives, 1988). Further, many of the 180 schools did not participate, but simply paid the fee to belong to the association (Morello & Soenksen, 1989). Flight from the activity, largely to CEDA debate, continued. Rowland & Deatherage (1988), wrote that by the late 1980s NDT was rapidly decreasing and that the entire activity was "perhaps dying" (p.246). Recently, Morello & Soenksen (1989) described policy debate as "sick and reversing this crisis will require bold initiatives" (p.20). In brief, participation is suffering.

Danielson & Pettus (1990) recently conducted a poll of active forensic programs. However, their poll did not discuss why the levels and types of debate participation have changed. This poll addresses that issue, as well as a wide variety of detailed information about forensics programs [Complete Poll Results are at Appendix 1].

METHODOLOGY

A questionnaire and a brief cover letter was sent to 354 colleges and universities in America. The list of schools was complied from those which were active in NDT, CEDA or Individual Events for the 1988-1989 school year. The polls were mailed September 4-6, 1990. Responses were received from September 10 to October 12, 1990.[1] In total, 130 responses were received, a 37% return rate.

RESPONDENTS

The respondents of the poll can be divided as follows:

Type of Program	Number	%
No forensics program for 1990-91 School year.....	11	8.5
Individual Events only.....	9	7.0
CEDA Debate only.....	12	9.3
NDT Debate only.....	9	7.0
SINGLE ACTIVITY PROGRAMS	30	23.3
Individual Events & Parliamentary Debate.....	3	2.3
CEDA Debate & Individual Events.....	66	50.7
NDT Debate & Individual Events.....	8	6.1
NDT Debate & CEDA Debate.....	1	0.7
ONE OR TWO ACTIVITIES PROGRAMS	108	83.1
NDT & CEDA Debate & Individual Events and CEDA.....	3	2.3
Individual Events, CEDA & Parliamentary Debate.....	8	6.1
THREE ACTIVITIES PROGRAMS	11	8.4
ALL FOUR ACTIVITIES PROGRAMS	0	0.0
TOTAL.....	130	100.0

II. STATUS OF FORENSIC PROGRAMS

A. PROGRAMS ARE GETTING MORE SPECIALIZED

As shown above, forensic programs are becoming highly specialized. Almost one-fourth of the respondents have only one forensic activity. Over three-fourths of the programs offer only one or two forensic events. Only 8.4% of the programs have three

events. None offer all four forensic activities. By specializing, smaller or less popular activities get abandoned. This may explain some of the decline in NDT participation.

B. FEW PROGRAMS HAVE GRADUATE ASSISTANTS

The use of graduate assistants is surprisingly small. Roughly sixty-percent of the respondents have no graduate assistants, part-time or full-time. Almost 80% have at most one graduate assistant. Less than 12% have more than 2 graduate assistants. A lack of graduate assistants puts a greater burden on the forensics director since he/she is responsible for all coaching, paperwork and travel, besides his/her normal teaching, research and community/university service obligations. This may also explain the specialization in forensics programs. Coaches, with a finite amount of time, must focus on just one or possibly two activities.

C. DOMINATED BY COMMUNICATION

Not surprisingly, the communications field dominates forensics. More than three-fourths of the respondents are professors, about 13% are department chairpersons and about 5% are adjunct faculty members in communication. Only 3.17% of the respondents were outside the department of communication, most of those being in theater.

D. PROGRAMS HAVE LONG TERM SUPPORT

The best news for the future of forensics is the dedication shown by the schools. Two-thirds of the respondents said their position with the school is permanent. Not only are the faculty permanent, but the forensics programs are also. The average age of forensic programs at the respondents' schools is between 16 and 30 years. Forensics budgets are doing well with over 74% percent stating their budgets either increased or remained relatively stable over the last five years. Less than 12% said their budgets have greatly decreased.

However, several respondents added that schools are hesitant to award tenure (or other benefits/awards) on the basis of work in the field of forensics. These respondents wrote that they must rely on their work in other communications fields to be considered for tenure. This is the biggest hindrance to a career in forensics. Besides spending a great deal of time traveling (and being away from your family), forensics directors are forced to have two simultaneous careers: forensics director and communication scholar/instructor. Often this burden discourages a career in forensics, to the detriment of all in the activity. To keep a permanent coaching pool, the forensics community must convince school administrators that forensics is not just an extra-curricular activity, but rather is a valuable part of a student's academic growth. Perhaps then a coach can be rewarded for his/her work in forensics.

E. SPECIFIC FORENSIC ACTIVITIES

1. NDT DEBATE

Only 16.15% of the respondent schools are active in NDT Debate. Of those participating, most are very active, large, specialized squads. Over 80% went to nine or more tournaments during the last year. Over half of those active in NDT Debate have four or more teams competing, an additional 33.33% have 2 or 3 teams. These schools also concentrate on this one activity. Forty-two percent of schools active in NDT Debate participate in nothing else. The one disparaging factor is advanced students dominate the activity, compared with other forensics activities, as the graph below shows.

Experience Levels of Forensics Participants

Students	NDT Debate	CEDA Debate	Individual Events
Novices	9.52	17.78	14.58
Intermediate	23.81	43.33	43.75
Advanced	66.67	38.89	41.67

2. CEDA DEBATE AND INDIVIDUAL EVENTS

This combination of activities represents the largest group of the respondents, as shown previously. Most schools participate in both activities. While these schools primarily have large programs [see graph below], they are not so dominated by advanced students.

Program Size

Percentages	CEDA DEBATE	INDIVIDUAL EVENTS
Participation:	69.23	73.85
9+ Tournaments:	54.44	58.95
Number of Students:	55.56*	80.00**

* 4+ Teams of CEDA Debate (An additional 38.89% have 2-3 teams).

** 6+ Individual Events Participants.

CEDA Debate, NDT Debate and Individual Events make up most forensics activities. However, a relatively new activity, Parliamentary Debate, styled after England's House of Parliament, has a small but significant following.

3. PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE

Parliamentary Debate is still in the beginning stages. Only 8.46% of the respondents are active in Parliamentary Debate. This may be lower than the actual level of participation since I could not find a list of active schools in Parliamentary Debate. Of those which are active, the overwhelming majority, 84.62%, went to two or fewer tournaments last year. Over half the respondents have only one parliamentary debate participant. Where NDT Debate was predominated by advanced students, just the opposite is true for Parliamentary Debate. Over half are novice, less than one-fourth are advanced. I expect parliamentary debate will drastically increase over the next ten years. It has great potential for growth. It encourages strong audience-oriented speaking skills and has a dash of humor to keep it inter-

esting for the lay person. It should be a welcome addition to any forensics program.

Forensics is doing well. Programs are advancing in their size and increasing in their competitiveness through specialization. New events, such as Parliamentary Debate, are being added, which can only draw more students and more academic support to the activity in the future. The one activity which has been suffering lately is NDT Debate. I will now focus on the declining participation in NDT Debate and add realistic solutions.

III. EXPLAINING THE DECLINE IN NDT: IS THE PROBLEM WITH NDT OR IS DECLINING PARTICIPATION A SYMPTOM OF A LARGER PROBLEM?

A. REASONS FOR THE DECLINE

Part of the poll [see Appendix 1] asked schools to describe what factors discouraged participation and what actions the forensics community could take to encourage participation. The schools were given a list of factors and were asked to determine which ones encouraged them to stop or limit their NDT Participation. They ranked their answers on a scale of one to five, one representing "strongest influence" and five being "no influence" on participation. The cumulative results of all respondents, ranked in order of their mean score, is in Appendix Two.

For this part of the analysis, I divided the schools into two groups: active in NDT Debate and not active in NDT Debate.[2] The following graph shows the perceptions of active NDT schools. They ranked the issues which they believe affected

other schools' NDT participation. The results are as follows:

Active NDT Debate Schools

RANK	ISSUE	MEAN SCORE
1.	Research burden	1.9000 *
2.	Too few regional teams	2.3000 *
3-4.	Budget limitations	2.5000 *
3-4.	Speaking rate	2.5000 *
5.	Travel/missing classes	3.5000
6.	Abuse of evidence	3.7000
7.	Subjective judges	3.7500
8.	Recruitment problems	3.8500
9.	Policy v. Value Debate	3.9000
10.	Unqualified judges	4.4500

Active NDT schools believed the main motivation for leaving the activity was the research required to be active in NDT Debate. The second through fourth ranked issues were very close: the number of regional teams; budget limitations and speaking rate. Only two relate to NDT Debate: the research burden and the speaking rate. Budgeting problems, stated as a major reason, are not intrinsic to NDT Debate. Further, having too few teams in the region shows the compounding effect of this problem. Once a group of schools leave the activity, the number of potential competitors decreases and the activity suffers, which encourages other schools (who may enjoy the activity) to leave. In brief, lacking participation (for whatever reason) in a forensic event will eventually snowball, as it has in NDT Debate. The first

four answers are distinguished from the others [by a *] since they had more than a "moderate influence" on average. The respondents believed the other issues had sharply lower influence on participation.

For comparison, the following scores represent those given by non-NDT Debate schools. They were asked to list the actual reasons they withdrew of limited their NDT Debate participation.

Schools Not Active in NDT Debate

RANK	ISSUE	MEAN SCORE
1.	Speaking rate	2.1494 *
2.	Research Burden	2.3636 *
3.	Too few regional teams	2.5057 *
4.	Abuse of evidence	2.8966 *
5.	Budget limitations	2.8977 *
6.	Policy v. Value Debate	3.2439
7.	Travel/missing classes	3.4598
8.	Subjective judges	3.5814
9.	Recruitment problems	3.5862
10.	Unqualified judges	4.1494

Non-active NDT schools had a much different view. Their primary motives were the speaking rate and the research burden, both of which are intrinsic [though not exclusive] to NDT Debate. These were closely followed by too few regional teams and budget limitations, problems not intrinsic to the activity. However,

non-active schools included the abuse of evidence as a reason which had more than a moderate influence in affecting participation. Active NDT Debate schools gave this a much lower score.

The poll asked an open ended question for any additional comments the respondents wished to make. Many added comments. The additional comments fell into two groups: those who abhor the present NDT Debate style and those who abhor the critics of NDT Debate. To say the very least, the additional comments were highly charged.

Supporters of the present NDT Debate system were the minority, even among active NDT Debate schools. Four respondents stated there are too few experienced NDT Debate coaches and the participation levels are low for this reason. That may be true, as this poll did not detail the qualifications and experience levels of the coaches. However, this view still implies (and some explicitly stated) that NDT Debate does not have any justified criticisms. That part of the analysis is disputed.

An extreme minority (to be more specific, a minority of one) were very venomous towards the critics of NDT Debate. That respondent stated "Lazy coaches are unwilling to coach rigorously, CEDA rewards this." The respondent did not clarify how and when CEDA Debate rewards lazy coaches. I believe the respondent was trying to explain that NDT Debate requires a lot more work for success, and since most coaches are lazy, they choose other forensic activities (like CEDA Debate). Although I believe this

view is not common, those who support it are so vocal that they discourage schools from entering NDT Debate, as the following comments show.

Critics of present NDT Debate make up the overwhelming majority of those outside and within the activity. As a group, they had four main complaints. The first is that NDT Debate emphasizes poor communication skills. They stated that their schools would not support an activity with such poor speaking skills. Please note communication skills also ranked as having the most influence for inactive NDT Debate schools.

Second, they wrote that NDT Debate, in its present form, discourages novices. Several factors lead to this. The emphasis on research mandated the need for backfiles, which benefit the established schools and discourage new programs. Further, advanced students dominate NDT Debate, thereby discouraging novices by limiting their chances of success. Third, NDT Debate needs an educational focus. They commented that NDT Debate emphasizes too much gamesmanship and far too little "real world" positions.

The final comment is the most damaging to NDT Debate. Nine respondents described NDT participants as "elitists." I found it strange that all nine would use the same word to describe NDT participants. They explained their major reason for abandoning NDT Debate was the people in it, not the activity itself (although many were critical of both). Many factors lead to this

view. First, NDT Debate is both small and dominated by advanced students. This makes the group of active NDT participants rather close, which creates the impression of being elitist. Second, almost half the active NDT Debate schools participate in nothing else. Many respondents (especially Individual Events schools) wrote that active NDT Debate programs treat Individual Events as a "step-child" of the forensics community. Finally, outspoken defenders of NDT Debate, as above, may be doing more harm to the activity. While intended to be a defense of NDT Debate, often it is interpreted as an attack on other forensics activities.

These views may be accurate, but overstated. Polls often encourage only the outspoken or those with an extreme position to respond. This may explain the heated comments from the respondents. However, the poll does list problems both from within and outside the activity that need solutions to increase NDT participation.

B. POSSIBLE CHANGES TO INCREASE PARTICIPATION IN NDT

The Poll asked if certain changes would influence participation in NDT Debate. Answers ranged on a scale of one to five, one being a "Strong Influence" and five being "No Influence." The cumulative results, ranked in order of mean score, is in Appendix Three.

Similar to above, I divided the respondents into active NDT Debate schools and non-active NDT Debate schools.[3] First I will consider the proposed changes from active NDT Debate schools.

Active NDT Debate Schools

RANK	ISSUE	MEAN
1.	Re-emphasize communication skills	2.8000
2.	Schedule tournaments for Saturday/Sunday Only	3.5000
3.	Release the topic in the Fall (August)	3.6000
4.	Re-align the NDT regions	3.6500
5.	Limit the number of tournaments	3.9474
6-7.	Require judge qualifications	4.1667
7-7.	Allow teams to select/disqualify some judges	4.1667
8.	Regulate the number/amount of scholarships	4.3000

Of the recommendations by active NDT Debate schools, only one has more than a moderate influence for affecting participation. However, one should not expect an overwhelming agreement on the solution, since some have not yet decided if there is a problem. It is promising to note that the top three answers were the same for active and non-active schools. Non-active schools results were as follows:

Schools Not Active In NDT Debate

RANK	ISSUE	MEAN
1.	Re-emphasize communication skills	1.7273
2.	Release the topic in the Fall (August)	3.0230
3.	Schedule tournaments for Saturday/Sunday Only	3.6207
4.	Require judge qualifications	3.6628
5.	Regulate the number/amount of scholarships	4.0455
6.	Limit the number of tournaments	4.0690
7.	Allow teams to select/disqualify some judges	4.1529
8.	Re-align the NDT regions	4.1705

As the data shows, non-active schools feel re-emphasizing communication skills would have the greatest influence on participation. This supports their view that the speaking rate is the biggest problem facing NDT Debate. Non-active and active schools agree that communication skills need to be the primary concern to regain participation. Both also agree that delaying the release of the topic and shortening tournaments would also have positive effects on participation. The potential solutions are agreed upon. All that remains is action.

IV. THE FUTURE OF INACTIVE SCHOOLS

One of my biggest causes for concern in doing the poll was the 8.5% of respondents which recently halted participation in all forensics activities. Accordingly, I separated their results and they are as follows:

Schools Without Any Forensics Activities

RANK	ISSUE	MEAN
1.	Budget limitations	2.0000
2.	Travel/missing classes	2.8571
3.	Research burden	3.2500
4.	Speaking rate	3.4286
5-6-7.	Too few regional teams	4.1429
5-6-7.	Recruitment problems	4.1429
5-6-7.	Subjective judges	4.1429
8-9-10.	Abuse of evidence	4.2857
8-9-10.	Policy v. Value Debate	4.2857
8-9-10.	Unqualified judges	4.2857

Over 56% of these respondents said budget limitations have the "strongest influence." None said budget limitations have "no influence." Four respondents added that financing was the sole reason for the loss of the forensics program. Travel was also a large concern of the inactive schools. Besides being the second highest score, two respondents added that travel (missing classes) is too much a burden on both faculty and students. However, it is positive to note that the two primary factors which discouraged these schools to stop participating had nothing to do with the activity itself: budgeting and travel.

The first two responses both have an average of less than three (3), which means that both have more than moderate influence on why participation has stopped. After the first and

second reasons, the data may be invalid since 56% of these responses were from department chairpersons who may not have an accurate or informed view of these issues. There is also a problem of distinguishing issues of NDT Debate from those of forensics in general, since these schools have no program at all.

The poll also asked these respondents to rate how the following changes would encourage them to rejoin NDT Debate. The results were not promising.

RANK	ISSUE	MEAN
1.	Schedule tournaments for Saturday/Sunday Only	3.7500
2.	Re-emphasize communication skills	4.1250
3-4.	Release the topic in the Fall (August)	4.2500
3-4.	Regulate the number/amount of scholarships	4.2500
5-6.	Limit the number of tournaments	4.3750
5-6.	Require judge qualifications	4.3750
7.	Allow teams to select/disqualify some judges	4.6250
8.	Re-align the NDT regions	4.7500

There is little chance of regaining inactive schools. No solution has more than a moderate influence, most have between little and no influence. This may be because their two key reasons for leaving forensics had nothing to do with the positive elements of the activities, but were administrative problems: travel and finances. This is also reflected in their predictions. When asked if these schools would be participating in NDT or Parliamentary Debate in 5 years, 70% responded with a probable

or definite no for both. When asked if their school would be participating in CEDA Debate or Individual Events in 5 years, 60% responded with probable or definite no for both. It appears that the inactive schools have been lost, with little chance of re-gaining them in the short term.

V. SUMMARY

The results from the poll are mostly positive: changes are needed and desired to increase participation. The only serious blemish to forensics is the loss of some schools which may not be quickly returning. However, their reasons for leaving do not reflect poorly on the activity, but rather show the extreme amount of dedication needed both from the participants and the school administrators to make a forensics program successful. It is hoped that armed with the result of this poll, the forensics community can return NDT Debate back to a popular and increasing-ly added forensics activity.

ENDNOTES

[1] One response was received January 4, 1991, but was excluded.

[2] I excluded from this analysis schools which have no forensics program for reasons which are detailed in Section Four.

[3] ibid.

REFERENCES

Ashmore, T.M., (1981), "The role of audience analysis in contemporary debate," The Forensic, 67, 21-27.

Danielson, M.A., Pettus, A.B., (1990), "Status of Forensics Programs: A Survey," Paper Presented to Forensics Division at 1990 Speech Communication Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Dempsey, R.H. & Hartman, D.J., (1986), "Emergent voting criteria and judicial impotence of critics," Journal of the American Forensic Association, 22, 167-175.

Howe, J.H., (1979), "Forensics in the 1970s -- a retrospective analysis," Speaker and Gavel, 17, 15-17.

Kovalcheck, K., (1979), "Retrospective on forensics in the 1970s," Speaker and Gavel, 17, 31-33.

Morello, J.T. & Soenksen, R.A., (1989), "Debate rules and the future of policy debate," Argumentation and Advocacy, 26, 11-21.

NDT Archives, (1988), University Library, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts.

Rowland, R.C., & Deatherage S. (1988, Spring). "The crisis in policy debate," Journal of American Forensic Association, 24, 246-250.

APPENDIX ONE

I. CUMULATIVE RESULTS

The following is a breakdown of the cumulative results put in the format of the original poll.

1. Does your school participate in NDT Debate?
Yes = 16.15%, No = 83.85%

Note: Questions 2 - 4 are based on only those who responded "Yes" to question 1.

2. How many teams participated in tournaments last year in NDT?
None = 9.52%, One = 0%, Two or Three = 33.33%,
Four or More = 57.14%.

3. How many NDT tournaments did your school attend last year?
0-2 = 4.76%, 3-5 = 4.76%, 6-8 = 9.52%,
9-10 = 14.29%, 10+ = 66.67%

4. How would you describe your competing NDT students?
Novice = 9.52%, Intermediate = 23.81%, Advanced = 66.67%

5. Does your school participate in Individual Events?
Yes = 73.85%, No = 26.14%

Note: Questions 6 - 8 are based on only those who responded "Yes" to question 5.

6. How many students participated in IE tournaments last year?
None = 1.05%, One or Two = 4.21%, Three to Five = 14.74%, Six or More = 80%

7. How many IE tournaments did your school attend last year?
0-2 = 8.42%, 3-5 = 11.58%, 6-8 = 21.05%, 9-10 = 12.63%, 10+ = 46.32%

8. How would you describe your competing IE students?
Novice = 14.58%, Intermediate = 43.75%, Advanced = 41.67%

9. Does your school participate in CEDA Debate?
Yes = 69.23%, No = 30.77%

Note: Questions 10 - 12 are based on only those who responded "Yes" to question 9

10. How many teams participated in CEDA tournaments last year?
None = 1.11%, One = 4.44%, Two or Three = 38.89%, Four or More = 55.56%

11. How many CEDA tournaments did your school attend last year?
0-2 = 1.11%, 3-5 = 14.44%, 6-8 = 30%, 9-10 = 10%, 10+ = 44.44%

12. How would you describe your competing CEDA students?
Novice = 17.78%, Intermediate = 43.33%, Advanced = 38.89%

13. Does your school participate in Parliamentary Debate?
Yes = 8.46%, No = 91.54%

Note: Questions 14 - 16 are based on only those who responded "Yes" to question 13.

14. How many teams participated in parliamentary tournaments last year?
None = 15.38%, One = 38.46%, Two or Three = 30.77%, Four or More = 15.38%

15. How many Parliamentary tournaments did your school attend last year?
0-2 = 84.62%, 3-5 = 7.69%, 6-8 = 7.69%

16. How would you describe your competing Parliamentary students?
Novice = 58.33%, Intermediate = 25%, Advanced = 16.67%

17. Over the last five years, MY SCHOOL's budget for Forensics has on a PER PUPIL basis:
Greatly Increased = 17.36% Slightly Increased = 25.62%
Relatively Stable = 31.4% Slightly Decreased = 12.40%
Greatly Decreased = 11.57% Varies Without a Pattern = 1.65%

18. How many Full-time Graduate Assistants does your program have?
None = 71.09%, One = 17.19%, Two = 7.03%,
Three = 2.34%, Four or More = 2.34%

19. How many Part-time Graduate Assistants does your program have?
None = 75.61%, One = 16.26%, Two = 4.88%,
Three = 0.81%, Four or More = 2.44%

20. How would you primarily describe your Graduate Assistants?
Note: This question was omitted due to small number of responses.

21. Will your school be participating in NDT Debate five years from now?
Definite Yes = 6.20%, Probable Yes = 13.18%, Uncertain = 15.5%
Probable No = 48.06%, Definite No = 17.05%

22. Will your school be participating in Individual Events five years from now?
Definite Yes = 46.51%, Probable Yes = 23.26%, Uncertain = 15.5%
Probable No = 11.63%, Definite No = 3.1%

23. Will your school be participating in CEDA Debate five years from now?
Definite Yes = 32.81%, Probable Yes = 36.72%, Uncertain = 14.84
Probable No = 10.94%, Definite No = 4.69%

24. Will your school be participating in Parliamentary Debate five years from now?
Definite Yes = 2.34%, Probable Yes = 7.81%, Uncertain =21.88%
Probable No = 44.53%, Definite No = 23.44%

25. My position with my school is:
Professor Communication = 77.78%,
Professor Another Field = 3.17%,
Adjunct in Communication = 4.76%,
Adjunct in Another Field = 0%,
Department Chairperson = 12.7%,
Graduate Assistant/Other = 1.59%

26. My involvement with the Forensics Program is expected to be:
Permanent = 66.93%, Temporary (2 years or less) = 11.81%,
Unknown = 21.26%

27. How many years has your school CONTINUOUSLY had a Forensics Program?
0-5 yrs = 10.16%, 6-10 yrs = 11.72%, 11-15 yrs = 3.91%
16-20 yrs = 10.16%, 21-30 yrs = 14.84%, 30+ yrs = 44.53%
Unknown = 4.69%

Which of the following factors affect schools' decision to NOT participate in NDT Debate?

Strong Influence 1 2 Moderate Influence 3 4 No Influence 5

	1	2	3	4	5
Budget limitations	30.51%	15.25%	22.88%	11.86%	19.49%
Research burden	31.62%	32.48%	17.09%	8.55%	10.26%
Abuse of evidence	25.22%	13.91%	11.30%	20.87%	28.70%
Too few regional teams	29.57%	25.22%	20.87%	7.83%	16.52%
Travel/missing classes	13.04%	17.39%	15.65%	22.61%	31.30%
Recruitment problems	9.57%	10.43%	19.13%	24.35%	36.52%
Speaking rate	47.41%	12.07%	18.10%	7.76%	14.66%
Subjective judges	11.40%	7.89%	19.30%	25.44%	35.96%
Unqualified judges	4.35%	2.61%	16.52%	20.00%	56.62%
Policy v. Value Debate	19.09%	10.00%	16.36%	17.27%	37.27%

How would the following changes influence schools' decision to INCREASE participation in NDT Debate?

Strong Influence 1 2 Moderate Influence 3 4 No Influence 5

Regulate the number/amount of scholarships
1 = 7.69%, 2 = 1.71%, 3 = 19.66%, 4 = 14.53%, 5 = 56.41%

Re-align the NDT regions
1 = 5.13%, 2 = 4.27%, 3 = 19.66%, 4 = 16.24%, 5 = 54.70%

Limit the number of tournaments
1 = 6.09%, 2 = 6.09%, 3 = 19.13%, 4 = 14.78%, 5 = 53.91%

Schedule tournaments for Saturday/Sunday Only
1 = 8.62%, 2 = 18.97%, 3 = 14.66%, 4 = 19.83%, 5 = 37.93%

Release the topic in the Fall (August)
1 = 16.38%, 2 = 15.52%, 3 = 28.45%, 4 = 11.21%, 5 = 28.45%

Re-emphasize communication skills
1 = 53.85%, 2 = 11.97%, 3 = 17.95%, 4 = 4.27%, 5 = 11.97%

Require judge qualifications
1 = 7.96%, 2 = 8.85%, 3 = 23.01%, 4 = 16.81%, 5 = 43.36%

Allow teams to select/disqualify some judges
1 = 3.57%, 2 = 6.25%, 3 = 16.96%, 4 = 15.18%, 5 = 58.04%

Appendix Two
Cumulative Results In Rank Order

RANK	ISSUE	MEAN SCORE
1.	Speaking rate	2.3017
2.	Research burden	2.3333
3.	Too few regional teams	2.5652
4.	Budget limitations	2.7458
5.	Abuse of evidence	3.1391
6.	Travel/missing classes	3.4174
7.	Policy v. Value Debate	3.4364
8.	Subjective judges	3.6667
9.	Recruitment problems	3.6783
10.	Unqualified judges	4.2174

Appendix Three
Cumulative Results in Rank Order

RANK	ISSUE	MEAN
1.	Re-emphasize communication skills	2.0855
2.	Release the topic in the Fall (August)	3.1983
3.	Schedule tournaments for Saturday/Sunday Only	3.5948
4.	Require judge qualifications	3.7876
5.	Limit the number of tournaments	4.0435
6.	Regulate the number/amount of scholarships	4.1026
7.	Re-align the NDT regions	4.1111
8.	Allow teams to select/disqualify some judges	4.1786